

# Outdated (Forgotten or Semi-Forgotten) Phraseology in the Vocabulary of Modern Russian

#### Turakulova Zarina Mardonkulovna

Teacher of the department of Russian Language and Literature Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

### ABSTRACT

In this article we will talk about obsolete units of the phraseological fund of the Russian language, including the vocabulary of phraseological expressions that have passed into the passive reserve of the language. Structural features of stable combinations are examined, the component characteristic of phraseology is given, in particular FE with outdated grammatical forms in its composition. Possible reasons for their withdrawal from active use are also given. The cases of return of phraseologisms into an asset of language and change of their semantic and functional qualities are considered.

**KEYWORDS:** phraseological fund of language, active and passive of language, vocabulary composition, outdated phraseology, structure, semantics, necrotism, biblysms, archaisms, historicisms, outdated grammatical forms of words.

The Phraseological Fund of Language is the national heritage of the people, an indicator of their spiritual and cultural identity. It is an inexhaustible living source, enriching the literary language with new expressive means, expanding the limits of its stylistic capabilities. The phraseology of modern Russian is the richest source of linguistic material, containing vivid features of the folk character, having a special national flavor. As part of the vocabulary, phraseology is subject to the same changes as the lexical level units. Changes in vocabulary and phraseology can be caused by both linguistic and extralinguistic factors that consistently influence the quantitative and qualitative composition of these strata.

The phraseological fund of the language can expand, adding new phraseological units or, on the contrary, shrink due to the elimination of phraseology, due to their obsolescence or de-actualization. The processes of archaization and neologization of the vocabulary of a language contribute, first of all, to socio-political, socio-economic, cultural and spiritual transformations in the life of society - the native speaker of that language. In connection with the transition to other social conditions, the development of science and technology, with the emergence of new realities of life, it is inevitable to change the linguistic picture of the world, which embodies the experience, knowledge and understanding of the surrounding reality. The change of the language environment in the context of new realities is a natural process in which the essence of any language is manifested as the main tool for reflecting the phenomena of reality. Today, the process of archaization of phraseological expressions is not well covered in the scientific linguistic literature. This is explained above all by the special nature of phraseologisms, the complexity of their semantics: unlike lexemes, phraseology not only serve to nominate the subject of thought, but more often express additional logical, emotive information. The expressiveness of phraseological expressions, their vivid figurative expressiveness allows the stable combinations longer to remain in the consciousness of carriers of linguistic culture even when the expression of its original image (internal form) motivates its meaning. There are many examples of this linguistic phenomenon. Let us take for comparison the phraseological aggregates,



due to their archaic nature, which have lost their original meaning: гол как сокол, собаку съесть, попасть впросак, ничтоже сумняшеся, баш на баш, сума голь перекатная, точить лясы, бить баклуши и т.п.

However, some scientists tend to believe that without the inner form and meaning of phraseology, "... phraseological units cannot successfully perform their communicative function when the inner form is lost, as there is a close relationship between the inner form, meaning and functioning of phraseology, when one phenomenon cannot exist without the other" [Dullayev 1996: 129]. This is the reason for the gradual withdrawal of phraseological turnover from the language asset. It is reasonable to assert that the older the phraseology, the weaker its connection with modern vocabulary and phraseology, the more intensive the process of its de-actualization proceeds.

The mobility of phraseology indicates the flexibility of the language, its communicative potential, inexhaustible language resources. The Russian language, being one of the richest world languages in terms of the number of lexical units, also has a huge phraseological fund. Explanatory and phraseological dictionaries of the Russian language have fixed an extensive layer of phraseological units of different structure and character of semantics, which allows us to estimate a large volume (though not all) of phraseological means of modern Russian literary language.

The phraseological dictionary of the modern Russian language in 2 volumes by A.N. Tikhonov incorporated a large number of phraseological units of the modern Russian language. The number of phraseologisms considered in it counts 35 thousand units, which is today the largest collection of phraseological units of the Russian language. The dictionary shows the dynamism of the development of the phraseological composition of the language, although, as we think, not fully: it does not reflect the process of of phraseology, which is the main way to expand and update its vocabulary. The dictionary observes, noted by the authors, a process of rapid obsolescence of linguistic units, their withdrawal from active use in the 20th century.

In studying outdated phraseology we relied on the phraseological corpus of this dictionary, compiled on the basis of the academic Dictionary of Modern Russian Literary Language in 17 volumes taking into account the additions made in the first 6 volumes. We have identified a large number of phraseologisms marked with special labels - "ustar" (obsolete) and "obsolete". However, in an attempt to study phraseologisms in detail, in determining their obsolescence, it became necessary to turn in parallel to various other sources, including the phraseological dictionary of the Russian language A.I. Fedorov, to the Modern Phraseological Dictionary A.V. Zhukov and M.E. Zhukova, to the Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language in 4 volumes under Ed. A.P. Evgeneva and other lexicographic works 20-21 centuries. A comprehensive approach in the study of the phraseological stratum of the Russian language has made it possible to identify many scientific problems in this field, to identify ways of their solution.

Considering the outdated FEs it should be noted that they make up about 1/10 part of the whole phraseological fund of the Russian language, representing stable words having different degree of semantic cohesion, having different degrees of semantic cohesion, for example:  $\partial yxobou \pi uu\kappa$  – Oven, pouring clock - hourglass, wash head (to whom) - strongly scold, chide,  $\kappa y \partial a bopoh \kappa ocmeu he sahocun$  – to the remotest places,  $\partial o benoeo ceema$  – before dawn, until morning, no account for the season ticket - above the usual, prescribed.

A smaller number of stable combinations, only 35, are labelled as "obsolete". These are those units of the phraseological system that are in an early stage of obsolescence: they are in a sort of fluctuating state between the lexical core of the language and its periphery. Compare examples, быть/оставаться в выигрыше – win, вскидывать очки/пенсне – wear glasses/pince-nez with quick movements, по ветхости/за ветхостью – due to old age, вдаваться в обман – be deceived, два Аякса – about two

inseparable friends; *глупые годы, лета* – on childhood, youth; *войти/впасть в гнев* (*во гнев*) – get angry, etc. We dedicated a separate paragraph of our chapter to the outdated phraseology.

In the definition of the composition of the phraseological system of language in the dictionary, a twopronged approach is applied: phraseology in a narrow sense - figurative expressions with a high degree of semantic cohesion - idioms, as well as phraseology in a broad sense of the word - All other types of stable combinations (including composite names and terms, various stable constructions with semantically integrated and non-meitic components). The tilde symbol "~" is used to denote the stable combinations that are the names of the phenomena of reality. For idiomatic expressions bearing a figurative value, the sign of a light diamond - " $\diamond$ " is applied.

Steady expressions with a high degree of semantic solidity, otherwise idiomatic expressions or simply "idioms", make up two groups of semantically indivisible revolutions - these are phraseological fusions and phraseological unities.

Phraseological associations are revolutions whose meaning is completely unreasonable. The total value of an expression is completely unrelated to the value of its components. Take, for example, the expression of *«колокола лить»*, meaning "gossip". His origin is connected with superstitious custom, which existed in Russia in the old times - to spread gossip during casting of a bell, to make it sound loud. Compare the examples of other phraseological associations that have lost their motivation over time and have become the category of phraseological associations *«co всеми онёрами»*: "with all its advantages, details," the phraseology widely used in the 19-20 centuries. in a cartel environment (for example, in a game of screw or whist), where *«*онёр» meant a trump card, from ten to ace. This phraseology has over time acquired a figurative meaning, thus expanding the range of its use. Having lost, and not immediately, its original value, it has passed into the category of phraseological joints.

Examples of phraseological units that have lost the original semantics are quite numerous. Compare: *посадить за верстак* – teach, *венчаться вокруг ракитового куста* – about the unwed couple, *дать березовой каши* – whip; *гроб повапленный* – about someone, something, hiding behind the appearance of the most negative, bad qualities; *страсбургский пирог* – game pate; *мыслете выделывать* – go halfway" about a drunk man, etc.

Note the semantic feature of phraseological unity. As you know, the indistinguishable meaning of phraseological unity arises as a result of merging the values of its individual constituents into a single generalized-portable semantics of the whole. They act as motivated units, possessing a certain figurative rod [Shansky 41]. Among the outdated combinations we are considering, we find a relatively large number of examples of phraseological unity. Compare: *nocmasumb в палки* – Inflict stick punishment , *между пальцев пройти* – miss; *Heбechaя* (Поднебесная) империя – Chinese empire; не велико кушанье/неважно кушанье – about not needing much attention; загонять экономию – «save, spend carefully; египетская тьма –about total darkness; повесить нос на квинту – to get depressed; выдать головой – give to slaughter to anyone; покрыться бессмертием – «to become famous; давать волю cepduy – allow yourself to get emotional" etc.

The idiomatic expressions in question usually have the following characteristics:

- 1. The presence of outdated grammatical forms of words;
- 2. Necrotism in component composition;
- 3. Presence of bibleisms in the PA.

On the basis of these features, it has become possible to divide the PA into appropriate groups. A detailed description of one of these groups will follow.

#### PA with outdated word forms

107 2835-1924 /© 2024 The Authors. Published by Academic Journal INC. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/bync-nd/4.0/)

#### **International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics** ISSN: 2835-1924 Volume 03 Number 01 (January) 2024 Impact Factor: 9.89 SJIF (2023): 5.322



Among the stable combinations of idiomatic character combinations are often found, containing in their composition outdated forms of different parts of speech, so-called word-forming archaisms. These are words with obsolete bases, which include in their morpheme composition word-forming and form-forming affixes, which have ceased to be productive and replaced in modern Russian by other forms with corresponding meanings and functions. Compare expressions that retain old forms - noun, indicating a change of grammatical structure of the language: *пороть на воздусях* – rod; *держать в хлопках* – Nurture, nurture, and protect. Bosdycax, xnonkax – outdated forms P.p., m. ch nouns air and cotton, which in modern Russian belong to the group singularia tantum and do not have the corresponding grammatical forms of number and case. Expressions no cio nopy - to date, koŭ paz - what time" have kept in its composition the obsolete enclictic forms of index and relative pronouns  $ce\ddot{u}$  – this and  $\kappa o\ddot{u}$  – which. In phraseology *norufouna* aku обре – «погибли, не оставив следа», we find traces of verb forms that functioned in the ancient Russian period of language existence, namely one of the forms of the past tense (aorist 3 l. plural.) from the verb «погибати» - noruбouua. This phraseology also includes the old form of the comparative particle «как»  $a\kappa u$ , and historicism  $o\delta pe$  – meaning the ancient Slavic name of the Turkic nomads of the Avars; another archaic form is preserved in biblical terms *отверзлись хляби небесные* – about the heavy rain, the rain", where I turned my back - the form 3 l. pl. ch. from the obsolete verb "turn it off", i.e. "open", "dissolve". As a variant in the texts of classical artistic works there is phraseology разверзлись хляби. Both variants belong to the book style. An example of another word-forming form from the verb "show" contains an expression казать себя – «показывать себя», where the archaic form of the infinitive to seem unlike the similar modern form does not have a base prefix and the shaping suffix imperfect form -ыва- (-ова-/-ева-), which is now considered one of the productive affixes in verb formation. Archaic grammatical forms of words are also present in phraseology *ничтоже сумняшеся*, where *ничтоже* – The outdated form of adverbs measures and degrees of "none at all, сумняшеся - archaic form of deiprissism from a verb «сумнятеся» -«сомневаться».

The presence of archaic grammatical forms in the structure of phraseologisms considered, on the one hand, indicates that they have a long-standing origin, belong to a completely different, in terms of diachrony, grammatical system of the Russian language, show the dynamism of development of its grammatical and word-forming levels, on the other hand, indicate the relative stability of some units of phraseological level, which can be "preserved" in a language that retains its original semantics and structure. In an attempt to understand why these expressions remain in the language for so long and fully perform their inherent communicative and nominative functions, we find that the unique feature of phraseological units is that, being unmotivated; they continue to exist in the language as a full-fledged expression language.

Some idiomatic combinations due to their stylistic expressiveness, special colorful sound, and as traditional elements of national speech culture are able to function for a long time in a language in that form, in which they formed as stable combinations.

## Used literature list:

- 1. "Phraseological dictionary of modern Russian literary language". In 2 volumes. Drafters: A.V. Korolkova, A.G. Lomov, A.N. Tikhonov. Under Rev. A.N. Tikhonova. M.: "Science", 2004.
- 2. Balakova D., Kovachova V., Mokienko V.M. Heritage of the Bible in Phraseology Greifswald, 2013.
- 3. Walter G., Mokienko V.M., Balakova D. Slavic phraseology and the Bible. Slovanska frazeologia a Biblia. Greifswald: Ernst-Moritz-Arndt-Universitat Greifswald, 2013.
- 4. Dullayev A.R. Phraseology: Internal form of units. Urgench, 1996. 96 p.
- 5. Explanatory dictionary of Russian language of the late XX century. (Language changes). Under Ed. G.N. Sklyarevskaya. SPb: "Folio Press", 2000.



- 6. Shansky N.M. Phraseology of modern Russian language. M.: "Higher School", 1963.
- 7. https://www.liveinternet.ru/community/moja\_polska/post188115836/
- 8. Ибаев, А. (2021). Comparative syntactic devices as an object of language study. Общество и инновации, 2(8/S), 153-159.